UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/766,093	01/27/2004	Eugenia E. Noble	10567-3805	2203
22235 MALIN HAI	7590 11/14/2007 LEY AND DIMAGGIO, PA	EXAMINER		
1936 S ANDREWS AVENUE			CHAPMAN, JEANETTE E	JEANETTE E
FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33316			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3633	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
•			11/14/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/766,093	NOBLE, EUGENIA E.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Jeanette E. Chapman	3633				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a. cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D. (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 J	anuary 2004.					
<u> </u>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-3</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>1 and 3</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) 2 is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	ar					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc		Examiner				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct		· ·				
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	' ' '				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:  1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority document	s have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority document						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prio	•	ed in this National Stage				
application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	` ''	ad				
dec the attached detailed office action for a list	or the defining copies not receive	.a.				
Attachment(s)						
1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:					

Art Unit: 3633

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1 and 3, drawn to a method, classified in class 705, subclass 1.
- II. Claim 2, drawn to a system, classified in class 52, subclass 79.1.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions Group I and Group II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case, the kiosk or system may be used in any environment where one desires to sell a particular type of product.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

proper.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is

Page 3

During a telephone conversation with Barry Haley on 10/24/07 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group II, claim2. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 1 and 3 have been withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Said kiosk lacks a positive antecedent in claim 2.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knight et al (2004/0088220) in view of Meyers (2285218).

Knight et al discloses an educational zone in a mall comprising(see abstract):

- a product storage kiosk unit, vending machine, that includes at least one stand alone vertical module in a child activity center such as a daycare center, educational zone;
- child specialty products, such as toys within the module for sale to visits to the child activity center; and
- child specialty products to visitors of the daycare center to eliminate additional shopping trips for child specialty products.

Meyers discloses a vending machine comprising a first stand alone product storage unit;

a plurality of glass doors 11 mounted on said vertical storage unit module; a plurality of, coin operated, locks each of which can lock a different door of the storage doors; child indicia 46 mounted on said storage unit capable of providing an aesthetic appearance for a child activity center; and Knight discloses a child activity center such as a daycare center or an educational zone including a hallway for receiving said kiosk or vending machine.

It would have been obvious to include the vending machine of Meyers to provide a convenient means to sell novelty items for theme products.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeanette E. Chapman whose telephone number is 571-272-6841. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-thursday, 8:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, CHILCOT RICHARD can be reached on 571-272-6777. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272,11000

Primary Examiner